

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 16, 2008, claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended and claims 7-9 have been canceled. Claims 7-8 are withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 1-6 and 10 are pending in the application.

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the drawings, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims to overcome the objections. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the claims does not narrow the scope of the claims, but rather merely clarifies the invention

In paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Office Action, the abstract was objected to.

In paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to.

Applicant respectfully traverses the objection to the abstract and the title of the invention, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the abstract and replaced the title as suggested.

In paragraph 6 on page 4 of the Office Action, the specification was objected to.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the specification, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims to overcome the objections. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the claims does not narrow the scope of the claims, but rather merely clarifies the invention

In paragraph 7 on page 4 of the Office Action, the claims were objected to because of informalities.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the specification, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims to overcome the objections as suggested. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the claims does not narrow the scope of the claims, but rather merely clarifies the invention

In paragraph 9 on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims to overcome the rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to the claims does not narrow the scope of the claims, but rather merely clarifies the invention

In paragraph 11 on page 5 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

In paragraph 12 on page 6, Claims 2-5, 9 and 10 were acknowledged as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended claims to more particularly distinguish the invention over the cited reference. Claim 1 has been combined with claim 9 as suggested. Claim 9 has been canceled and claim 10 has been amended to correct its dependency. Claims 7-8 have been canceled as being drawn to a non-elected species.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that, in view of the amendments and remarks above, the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 865-380-5976.

Respectfully submitted,

Merchant & Gould
110 McGhee Tyson Blvd
Suite 203
Alcoa, TN 37701
865-380-5976

By: 
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204